

**Bottcher, Helen**

---

**From:** (b) (6)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 29, 2016 12:17 PM  
**To:** wyckoffcomments  
**Subject:** Wyckoff Super Fund Site 2016 Comment

Re: Bainbridge Island Wyckoff Superfund Site Proposed Remediation

Though the EPA has addressed the Wyckoff Superfund Site for many years, only recently have I, and other Bainbridge Islanders, been made aware of the mechanics of Alternative 7 as a future remedy.

I object to Alternative 7 for three reasons:

1) The process of using cement solidification focuses on containment, not removal, and will not eliminate cancer-causing chemicals from the site. 2) The cement solidification would force hazardous waste deeper into the aquifer contaminating our limited ground water supply further. 3) Alt. 7 would lead to an even bigger cost clean up down the road with the additions of thousands of tons of contaminated concrete slurry added to the site.

The estimated cost of Alternative 7 is \$80 million. That would be \$80 million spent *knowing* that cancer-causing chemicals will not be eliminated.

There is another alternative, Alternative 6, which, in the modification suggested by geologists Gander/Keenan, will remove hot spots through a high-heat burn. Alternative 6 is all-around more effective because it is a more permanent solution.

As a Bainbridge Island resident, I'm very concerned about the harbor's active-pollution impact on our aquaculture and human health. I endorse the modification plan of Alternative 6 and urge the EPA to follow this line of remediation.

Respectfully,

(b) (6)

Bainbridge Island, WA